



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/712,307

11/12/2003

Shyam Kapur

017887-011400US

8867

29989

7590

10/03/2006

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER

LE, DEBBIE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2168

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/712,307	Applicant(s) KAPUR, SHYAM	
	Examiner DEBBIE M. LE	Art Unit 2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-44 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-25, 27-37 and 39-44 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 26 and 38 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/18/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's argument filed on 7/10/06. Claims 21-44 are pending for examinations.

Claim Objections

Claim 33 is objected to because of the following informalities: in claim 33, line 10, please delete blank space between "an" and "d". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21, 25, 27-33, 37, 39-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frank et al (WO 02/19147 A1) in view of Veale (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0188586 A1).

As per claim 1, **Frank** discloses a method for processing queries, the method comprising:

Sorting queries into a plurality of subsets along a dimension (as search queries submitted by users, then the system cluster the search queries by topic, page, 17, lines 5-15, page 9, lines 8-9), **wherein the plurality of subsets includes a first subset and a second subset** (as groups subgroup of users based on user-submitted queries, page 17, lines 17-25 or queries from a particular subset of users, page 18, lines 26);

concept network for the first subset of queries and second subset of queries (as links on web pages of a particular web server on the Internet, page 22, lines 27-30, page 12, line 24);

generating trend information (page 17, lines 6-7, page 17, lines 12-18).

Frank does not explicitly teach generating a concept network, performing a comparison between the first concept network and second concept network. However, **Veale** discloses generate concept network (para. 0038) and performing a comparison between the first concept network and second concept network (0115). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill on the art at the time invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement the step of generating concept network for the first and second subset of queries and comparing between the first and second concept network as disclosed by Veale because it would provider Frank's system a useful to obtain the information if they reflect the same content in the subset of the queries (i.e., re-rank search results for user B, who is in some way similar to user A) (see Frank, page 21, lines 1-9).

As per claim 25, Frank teaches the dimension is a vertical dimension representing a user context of the query (page 20, lines 2-9).

As per claim 27, Frank teaches wherein the step of generating trend information includes generating trend information for said unit relative to the dimension (page 18, lines 26-30).

As per claim 28, Frank teaches receiving a first query, wherein the first query contains one or more terms (page 9, lines 8-10); and using the trend information in formulating a response to the first query, wherein a response to the first query contains one or more records (page 19, lines 10-30, page 20, lines 10-12).

As per claim 29, Frank teaches using the trend information to resolve an ambiguous term of the first query (page 14, lines 11-30).

As per claim 30, Frank teaches using the trend information to suggest a second query, wherein the second query contains at least one term different than said first query (page 21, lines 1-9).

As per claim 31, Frank teaches using the trend information to group the one or more records in the response to the first query (page 20, lines 1-13).

As per claim 32, Frank teaches using the trend information to select an advertisement for display (page 21, lines 5-9).

Claim 33 is rejected under the same rationale as state in claim 21 arguments. Frank further discloses a clustering module (page 20, lines 1-9) and a trend analysis module (page 19, lines 8-9).

Claims 37, 39-44 have similar limitation as claims 27-32; therefore, they are rejected under the same subject matter.

Claims 22-24, 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frank et al (WO 02/19147 A1) in view of Veale (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0188586 A1) and further in view of Hansen et al (U.S Patent App. Pub.No. 2003/0014399 A1).

As per claims 22-24, Frank and Veale do not explicitly teach wherein the dimension is a time dimension, wherein the dimension is defined by reference to one or more demographic characteristics of users, wherein the dimension is a geographic dimension, wherein the dimension is a vertical dimension representing a user context of the query. However, Hansen discloses the dimension is time, demographic characteristics of users, a geographic (para. 0052, 0110). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill on the art at the time invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references implement the step of dimension is time, user's demographic and geographic in order to improve Frank's system to narrow search retrieval and/or direct users to web pages in a particular common interest (i.e., based on demographic) and/or location (i.e., geographic).

Claims 34-36 have similar limitation as claims 22-24; therefore, they are rejected under the same subject matter.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 26, 38 are allowable over the prior art of record because the prior art of record fails to teach or fairly suggest generating trend, information includes performing a comparison of information from the first concept network related to a unit with information from a second concept network related to the same unit.

Claims 26, 38 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21-44 filed on 7/10/06 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEBBIE M. LE whose telephone number is (571) 272-4111. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



DEBBIE LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

9/28/06